

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,784	09/19/2003	Thomas H. Chuang	STL11057	6734
7590 03/08/2005			EXAMINER	
Kirk A. Cesari			LAU, TUNG S	
Seagate Technology LLC Intellectual Property Dept SHK2LG			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1280 Disc Drive			2863	
Shakopee, MN 55379-1863			DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·a				he		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/665,784	CHUANG, THOMAS H.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Tung S. Lau	2863			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ware to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Fe	ebruary 2005.				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This	action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4) 🖂	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-5,7-16 and 18-20</u> is/are rejected.					
·	Claim(s) <u>6 and 17</u> is/are objected to.					
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) \square objected to by the $\mathfrak l$	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	∍ 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen		_				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		eatent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8, 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jardine et al. (U.S. Patent 4,958,125).

Regarding claim 8:

Jardine discloses a rotating disc data storage device balancer for measuring vibration comprising: a motion sensitive transducer attachable to the data storage device comprising an output producing a time domain analog signal in response to the vibration (Col. 2, Lines 4-54, fig. 2); a timing sensor adapted to detect an instantaneous speed of the disc stack (fig. 3); and means for processing the transducer signal in determining a magnitude and phase of the signal at a frequency determined by the timing sensor (fig. 1, unit 28).

Regarding claim 13, Jardine discloses the means for processing is characterized by a comparator determining whether the magnitude of the vibration signal at the frequency associated with the instantaneous speed of the rotating member is greater than a preselected threshold (Col. 6, Lines 33-54, Col. 7-8, Lines 63-30); Regarding claim 14, Jardine discloses the instantaneous speed is associated

with a transient start up state of the article's rotating disc and is less than the operating speed of the disc (Col. 1, Lines 15-47, fig. 1, unit 14); Regarding claim 15, Jardine discloses simultaneous vibration signal along different planes (Col. 2, Lines 26-33); Regarding claim 16, Jardine discloses the transducers are positioned orthogonally (Col. 3-4, Lines 58-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
 - a. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jardine et al. (U.S. Patent 4,958,125) in view of Cobern (U.S. Patent 4,647,853).

Regarding claim 1:

Jardine discloses a device for measuring vibration in an article having a rotating member, the device comprising: a motion sensitive transducer attachable to the article comprising an output producing a time domain analog signal in response to the vibration (abstract); data acquisition member comprising an input connected to the transducer output for sampling the transducer signal and comprising an output producing a time domain signal from the sampling (fig. 2,

3); a timing sensor adapted to detect an instantaneous speed of the rotating member and triggering the data acquisition member to begin sampling when the rotating member is rotating (Col. 1-2, Lines 5-62), and a processor (fig. 1, unit 28) comprising an input connected to the data acquisition member output for translating the time domain signal to a frequency domain signal and determining the magnitude and phase of the vibration signal at a frequency associated with the instantaneous speed of the rotating member (Col. 4-6, Lines 21-54, fig. 3-4).

Regarding claim 18:

Jardine discloses a method for measuring vibration in an article having a rotating member, the method comprising: orienting a motion-sensitive transducer on the article for detecting a vibration signal that is proportional to the article vibration along a desired direction (abstract); detecting the instantaneous speed of the rotating member (Col. 1, Lines 5-14); sampling the vibration signal in obtaining a time domain signal of the vibration; translating the time domain signal to a frequency domain signal; and determining the magnitude and phase of the frequency domain signal at the frequency associated with the instantaneous speed of the rotating member (Col. 2-5, Lines 20-20, fig. 3-5).

Regarding claim 2, Jardine discloses the means for processing is characterized by a comparator determining whether the magnitude of the vibration signal at the

frequency associated with the instantaneous speed of the rotating member is greater than a preselected threshold (Col. 6, Lines 33-54, Col. 7-8, Lines 63-30); Regarding claim 3, Jardine discloses the rotating speed is less than the speed of the member (abstract); Regarding claim 4, Jardine discloses simultaneous vibration signal along different planes (Col. 2, Lines 26-33); Regarding claim 5, Jardine discloses the transducers are positioned orthogonally (Col. 3-4, Lines 58-20); Regarding claims 7, 12, Jardine discloses perform Fourier transform on the signal (Col. 7-8, Lines 35-30, fig. 3); Regarding claim 10, Jardine discloses triggered sensor when the disc begin rotating (fig.2, 3); Regarding claim 11, Jardine discloses comparing frequency domain signal (fig. 3); Regarding claim 19, Jardine discloses rotation greater than zero (fig. 3); Regarding claims 20, 9, Jardine discloses comparing the magnitude of the signal at the frequency associated with the instantaneous speed of the rotating member with a preselected threshold (Col. 2-5, Lines 34-20). Jardine does not disclose the use of digital, analog and digital converter format, Cobern discloses the use of digital, analog and digital converter format (fig. 4,

unit 102, 104), in order not to have to require extensive modification of the system (Col. 1, Lines 40-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Jardine to have the use of digital, analog and

digital converter format taught by Cobern in order not to have to require extensive modification of the system (Col. 1, Lines 40-55).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 6, 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: prior art fail to teach the use of optic sensor for rotation detection.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments filed 2/14/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - A. Applicant argues in the arguments that the prior art does not show the 'a timing sensor adapted to detect an instantaneous speed of a rotating member and triggering the data acquisition member to begin sampling when the rotating member is rotating'. Jardine discloses 'a timing sensor adapted to detect an instantaneous speed of a rotating member and triggering the data acquisition

member to begin sampling when the rotating member is rotating' in Col. 3, Lines 4-15, fig. 4a, 4b and 4c, fig. 1 unit 28

B. Applicant argues in the arguments that the prior art does not show the 'a rotating disc data storage device balancer'. Jardine discloses 'a rotating disc data storage device balancer' in fig. 2, fig. 1, unit 28, fig. 6a-6c, Col. 3, Lines 4-15. The examiner reminds the applicant, while the meaning of claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allowed and although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung S Lau whose telephone number is 571-272-2274. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on 571-272-2269. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BRYAN BUI PRIMARY EXAMINER

7/4/56

TL